Location reference	Phase 9-1
Town	Addington
Ward	Downs & Mereworth
Road / Area	A20 London Road (east of Church Road)
Requested by	TMBC parking
Plan reference:	DD-508-13 Phase 9 - Addington - A20 London Road - east of
	Church Road

## **Summary**

Existing TRO does not correctly reflect restrictions and should be re-made.

#### Issue

Parking restrictions introduced by Kent County Council are not correctly shown in the onstreet Traffic Regulation Order due to compilation errors in 2008. The original Order was correctly made but needs to be included in the current Order to be enforceable.

## Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 29 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	1 (100%)	0	0	1 (3.4%)

#### **Analysis**

The response rate was very low, which indicates that there is general acceptance of the value of the existing restrictions.

### Recommendation

In light of the very low but positive consultation response, it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

## **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 29 properties, we received no responses.

## **Formal Recommendation**

As there were no objections to the proposal, the changes to the Order are to be made and the restrictions be introduced.

Location reference	Phase 9-2
Town	Addington
Ward	Downs & Mereworth
Road / Area	A20 London Road (near Hernewell Farm)
Requested by	TMBC parking
Plan reference:	DD-508-14 Phase 9 - Addington - A20 London Road - near
	Hernewell Farm

## **Summary**

Existing TRO does not correctly reflect restrictions and should be re-made.

#### Issue

Parking restrictions introduced by Kent County Council are nor correctly shown in the onstreet Traffic Regulation Order due to compilation errors in 2008. The original Order was correctly made but needs to be included in the current Order to be enforceable.

## Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 4 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 4 properties, asking residents for their views, but we received no response

#### Recommendation

As there was no response, it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

# **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 4 properties, we received no responses.

#### **Formal Recommendation**

As there were no objections to the proposal, the changes to the Order are to be made and the restrictions be introduced.

Location reference	Phase 9-3
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green
Road / Area	Fairfield Road
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD-508-09 Phase 9 - Borough Green - Fairfield Road

## **Summary**

Reduction of existing double yellow lines

#### Issue

Local resident has asked that the double yellow lines be removed from in front of her access as she does not use it, and would like her visitors to park in the road at that location.

## Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 8 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	4 (50%)

## **Analysis**

The responses rate was good, and the views were pretty evenly split between those wanting the changes and those that did not.

The objector did not comment against the proposal to shorten the restrictions in principle, but wished to retain the yellow lines in front of their driveway. This could be accommodated by a minor reduction of the scope of the proposal.

The "Don't Know" was more concerned with the legality of parking in front of driveways, rather than the proposal itself.

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals be reduced to a removal of the yellow lines in front of No.163's access only, and then proceed to formal consultation.

## **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 8 properties, we received 4 responses, 3 in favour of the proposal and one against.

# **Analysis**

The objection stated that the removal of the double yellow lines in front of the driveway to No.163 would lead to parking that would impede on access to their property. However, this is unlikely to be a significant or common occurrence, and the driveway to the objector's property would retain its double yellow lines.

## **Formal Recommendation**

Location reference	Phase 9-5
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green
Road / Area	High Street
Requested by	Cllr Mike Taylor
Plan reference:	DD-508-11 Phase 9 - Borough Green - High Street

## **Summary**

Change limited waiting bay to disabled bay

#### Issue

There has been a request for better disabled parking in Borough Green High Street to allow improved access to the chemists for those with mobility issues.

## Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 33 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	4 (100%)	0	0	4 (12.1%)

## **Analysis**

The responses were generally in favour of the proposal, though one asked that the disabled parking bays in the High Street be time limited to allow overnight parking.

However, this can be problematic if a vehicle remains parked in a disabled parking bay, particularly at the start of a daytime restriction. There remains a parking bay on-street that is available to park in overnight, and if this is not available there is parking capacity in other on-street bays and the nearby off-street parking facilities.

# Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

## **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 33 properties, we received 4 responses, 3 in favour of the proposal and one against.

## **Analysis**

The objection that an additional disabled bay would be pointless as many disabled drivers

would continue to park on the double yellow lines opposite, and a CCTV system to enforce would work better.

Disabled drivers are allowed to park on double yellow lines where they do not cause an obstruction for the period that their blue badge allows, however, they are encouraged to use defined disabled parking facilities.

Due to national legislation requirements we are unable to introduce a CCTV system for parking enforcement.

# **Formal Recommendation**

Location reference	Phase 9-6
Town	Burham
Ward	Burham & Wouldham
Road / Area	Court Road and New Court Road (Spur road)
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD-508-08 Phase 9 - Burham - Court Road

## **Summary**

New double yellow lines to prevent obstruction

#### Issue

The Parish Council have passed on concerns about parking around the new junctions of the New Court Road spur road that could cause an obstruction.

#### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 8 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0	4 (50%)

## **Analysis**

The responses against the proposal were from residents who wished to maintain parking close outside their homes.

The proposals are intended to prevent obstructive parking around the new junctions, and have also been designed to free-up some parking at the cul-de-sac end of the road, which should reduce any displacement effect.

Whilst it is desirable to retain on-street parking where possible, the current parking could be accommodated with the area where lines are proposed to be removed, or further down Court Road where parking is normally available.

# Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

## **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 8 properties, we received 1 response, against the proposal. Burham Parish Council also responded in favour of the proposed changes.

# **Analysis**

The objection relates to the history of Court Road and the change in use that is has experienced over time as development has taken place.

The proposals are intended to deter parking around the junction, to enable turning movements of vehicles and to deter any obstructive parking. The proposals echo the advice set out in the Highway Code, not to park near to junctions.

# **Formal Recommendation**

Location reference	Phase 9-9
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield (South)
Road / Area	New Hythe Lane / Laburnum Drive
Requested by	Cllr. Anita Oakley
Plan reference:	DD-508-15 Phase 9 - Larkfield - New Hythe Lane

## **Summary**

Daytime parking restrictions to prevent obstruction

#### Issue

Parking close to the Laburnum Drive junction of New Hythe Lane reduces traffic flow and creates congestion. This is predominantly parking by residents who have little off-street parking provision.

#### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 30 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	1 (7.7%)	12 (92.3%)	0	13 (43.3%)

## **Analysis**

The large majority of responses were against the proposal, mainly citing the lack of alternative parking provision, but also commenting that the removal of parking could lead to an increase of vehicle speeds.

#### Recommendation

The nearby residents have made a clear statement over the potential loss of parking facility. With this in mind it is recommended that the proposal be abandoned.

It has to be considered that the Borough Council's function is to consider amenity parking issues, and matters of highway safety and congestion management fall within the remit of the County Council. Having had a definite steer from residents, and our limited grounds for considering restrictions, if there are still concerns for safety and congestion management then it would be for the Highway Authority to investigate and consider.

## JTB decision on informal consultation

The Board reviewed the responses and the recommendation, but decided to take the proposals forward to formal consultation as they are intended to address obstructive parking issues and to help promote the free flow of traffic.

#### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We

also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 30 properties, we received 19 responses – 9 from immediate frontagers and 10 from other members of the public, all of whom reside in the nearby area.

Of those 19 responses, 9 supported the proposal (one wanted a longer time restriction), 9 were against the proposal and one didn't express an opinion on the proposal, but wanted 24hr restrictions to prevent all parking.

East Malling & Larkfield Parish Council responded in support of the proposals. Additionally, one of the local Borough members, Cllr Oakley responded in support of the proposals, but asked that the afternoon restriction run 4pm-6pm rather than 3pm to 6pm.

Kent County Council (in the role of the Highway Authority) responded in favour of the proposals, but also wished that the afternoon restriction run 4pm-6pm rather than 3pm to 6pm.

## **Analysis**

It should be noted that 8 of the 9 objections relate to properties directly affected by the restrictions, which have no off-street parking. However, there is no right to park on the public highway, and it is tolerated only where it does not cause a danger or an obstruction. It must also be considered that the principle purpose of the public highway is to facilitate travel and not for the storage of vehicles.

In the case of the parking on this section of New Hythe Lane the parking that occurs does obstruct the free flow of traffic, especially at peak times, and a balance needs to be struck between the needs of the travelling public and the convenient parking of residents.

The proposal are designed to provide some level of balance, with parking removed at peak times to assist traffic flow, but retained off-peak to allow residents to park, and to take advantage of the associated speed-reducing effects of parking when traffic flows are lighter.

The proposal for the afternoon restriction to run from 3pm to 6pm reflects that there is an increase in vehicle movements from approximately 3pm associated with nearby school traffic. However, the predominant peak period on the A20 and New Hythe Lane starts at approximately 4pm.

This is reflected by the Highway Authority's comments.

## **Formal Recommendation**

It is recommended that in light of the Highway Authority's comments the Board set aside the objections and that the changes to the Order are to be made and the restrictions be introduced, but with the afternoon restriction time reduced to 4pm-6pm as suggested by the Highway Authority.

Location reference	Phase 9-19
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Castle
Road / Area	Dry Hill Park Road
Requested by	Clirs Branson & Baldock
Plan reference:	DD-508-17 Phase 9 - Tonbridge - Dry Hill Park Road

## **Summary**

Local Councillors received requests for changes to parking bays and yellow lines to improve vehicle movements and assist traffic flow

#### Issue

Parking in 15 minute short-stay parking bays is unenforceable due to changes in national legislation, and the bays restrict traffic movements. The bays have been removed on a temporary basis and a permanent solution is now sought.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 27 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	0	10 (37%)

## **Analysis**

The majority of the responses indicated that the temporary changes to parking arrangements had been beneficial. Of the two responses against the proposal, one was that it would put more pressure on other parking bays in the road, and the other was from Hilden Oaks School, who wanted to maintain parking bays on their side of the road to facilitate pick-up and drop-off, and suggested relocating the existing bays on the south side to the north side of the road.

The Bursar of the school also suggested that there had been an increase in vehicle speed along Dry Hill Park Road, and that delivery vehicles had problems making their deliveries.

The issue of speed outside the school is of concern, but from observation seems to be around the 30mph speed limit (though it may have been lower with the previous arrangement). This is an issue that ought to be reviewed by Kent Highways as safety outside schools is part of their remit.

Loading or unloading should not be an issue as this is allowed for large or bulky items on the double yellow lines – or the school could use their existing forecourt area.

#### Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

## **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 27 properties, we received 44 responses (indicating that the consultation had been widely circulated), with 10 in favour of the proposal and 34 against (though 2 gave no reasons).

# **Analysis**

The consultation responses were polarized, with those in favour being from the nearby residential properties, and those objecting relating to Hilden Oaks School.

The comments in favour of making the temporary changes permanent indicated that they felt the changes had been beneficial and had improved access and traffic flow.

The comments against were broadly relating to the inconvenience of having to park further away – though there were also comments about loading and unloading at the school.

It is not practicable to list all of the nuances of the 34 objections, so Members are advised to review the full responses in the Annex.

## **Formal Recommendation**

Given that the changes are materially in place and have been welcomed by the residents as an improvement, it is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and that the changes to the Order are to be made and the restrictions be introduced.

Location reference	Phase 9-11
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Castle & Medway
Road / Area	High Street (north of Big Bridge) and west end of Lyons Crescent
Requested by	TMBC Parking
Plan reference:	DD-508-18 Phase 9 - Tonbridge - High Street

## **Summary**

Changes to parking bays, revised yellow lines and new P&D short-stay parking for shoppers.

#### Issue

The existing yellow line parking restrictions to the north of Lyons Crescent do not match the markings on street and require updating. The parking bays on the west side and at the western end of Lyons Crescent could provide valuable short-stay parking, allowing better shopper access to the upper High Street.

#### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 173 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	7 (53.8%)	6 (46.2%)	0	13 (7.5%)

### **Analysis**

The response rate was very low, which is normally an indicator that most of those contacted are not concerned by the proposals.

One in favour suggested that the taxi bay on the east side of the High Street near 113-115 should be altered to a loading bay as businesses in the area have problems with loading.

Two objections were that there would be difficulties for loading and unloading near No.143 – however this is close to a proposed loading bay on the east side of the road.

One objection was that the proposals would encourage illegal and obstructive footway parking – however the proposals would allow stronger and more effective enforcement of this.

One objection requested that 30 minute free parking be allowed to pick up from local takeaways

There was also comment from a couple of objectors that the 2 hour limited waiting needs to be controlled to prevent the spaces being blocked, with a suggestion that there ought to be Pay & Display to improve space turnover.

One objection was that the 2 hour limit was too long, and parking should only be available for short periods.

There was general support for the other elements of the proposals if there was adequate enforcement.

## Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

## **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

We wrote directly to 173 residential and commercial properties, as well as placing notices on-street, in the local press and on our web pages.

We received 8 responses. This is a low response rate and suggests most are accepting of the proposal.

One response objected, stating that people park in the laybys for 24 hours, which doesn't allow delivery people to park and deliver. There ought to be a 30 minute time limit on parking.

One response objected that they wanted their small business to survive; therefore they wanted people to come and park any time they want.

One response stated that the proposals would prevent customers from attending their shop, and would also impact on their delivery service, and may cause the business to relocate, removing jobs from the local economy. They asked for increased stopping areas to enable customers to attend their shop and other small businesses.

One response was in favour of the proposal.

One response was in favour of the proposal, but suggested that the free parking bays should be restricted to 30 minutes only, as it allows people to drop off and pick up.

One response was in favour, as long as the restrictions are thoroughly policed.

One response was in favour, but wanted a loading bay on the east side of the road near 113 and 115, rather than a taxi bay.

One response was from a business that has a need to load and unload sensitive items in Castle Street, and wanted to maintain this facility.

Of the responses, 3 are objections, though one objection (and one in favour) asked for stronger time limits than proposed rather than against the measures.

The two objections that wanted more parking for customers to park anywhere were from two properties forming a local takeaway business which is already located in an area where waiting is prohibited, and so there would not be a material change. They already have a

habit of parking their vehicle that they use for deliveries on the footway, which impedes pedestrian movement in the area, rather than park in one of the laybys, approximately 30m away.

## **Analysis**

The proposals are intended to better manage the parking arrangements in the area, and allow enforcement against long-stay parking that occurs in the lay-bys, blocking turnover of spaces for customers of the local premises.

In response to the comment asking for an additional loading bay in the High Street near to No's 115 and 115, the proposals include a loading bay on the east side of the road to the north of East Street and loading and unloading will still be permitted on double yellow lines just off the High Street in Lyons Crescent for the premises nearby.

# **Formal Recommendation**

Location reference	Phase 9-12
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Higham
Road / Area	Hunt Road
Requested by	Housing Association
Plan reference:	DD-508-19 Phase 9 - Tonbridge - Hunt Road

## **Summary**

New double yellow lines to prevent obstruction

#### Issue

Residents have reported problems with people blocking access to the recently constructed Circle Homes Russet parking bays.

## Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 12 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)	0	7 (58.3%)

## **Analysis**

There was a good level of response. One objector commented that there was insufficient parking in the area and any restriction would displace parking along the road.

Another objector commented that people only park in the area of the proposed lines as they thought the bays were only for residents.

A couple of objectors suggested that yellow lines would make no difference.

One objector (who does not have a car) indicated that there may be nowhere for family to park when visiting.

One objector commented that the yellow lines would prevent her from unloading shopping (however, this is allowed on double yellow lines)

One who commented in favour of the proposals asked that the parking bays be allocated to particular residents or properties, but the parking bays are the responsibility of the local Housing Association.

One commented that the proposals are only to prevent parking outside of one resident's property, who does not like cars being parked there,

## Recommendation

The proposals are intended to make the parking bays more accessible, so that the off-street

parking can be used effectively. Therefore it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

#### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 12 properties, we received 4 responses, 2 in favour of the proposal and 2 against.

# **Analysis**

One objection was that several households in the road had a number of cars, which reduces parking space availability, and that the parking spaces should be allocated to those who can't have driveways.

The other objection was from a resident who experienced problems finding a place to park late at night, and so sometimes has to park in the turning circle.

However, the proposals are intended to help maintain access to the parking bays, as obstructive parking has been an issue.

The parking bays themselves are outside of the Borough's remit and are the responsibility of the local Housing Association, and it would be for them to consider any allocation of parking within those spaces, but regardless of this, access should be maintained.

## **Formal Recommendation**

Location reference	Phase 9-15
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Preston Road
Requested by	Cllrs Bolt & Cure
Plan reference:	DD-508-20 Phase 9 - Tonbridge - Preston Road

## **Summary**

New permit parking bays

#### Issue

Residents have asked that permit parking restrictions be extended to cover a redundant vehicle access and to be extended at the southern end of the road to provide additional parking opportunities.

#### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 31 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	10 (100%)	0	0	10 (32.3%)

## **Analysis**

The responses were strongly in favour of the proposal, with no objections.

#### Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

#### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 31 properties, we received 5 responses, all in favour of the proposals

## **Formal Recommendation**

As there were no objections to the proposal, the changes to the Order are to be made and the restrictions be introduced.

Location reference	Phase 9-20
Town	Wouldham
Ward	Burham & Wouldham
Road / Area	School Lane
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD-508-06 Phase 9 - Wouldham - School Lane

## **Summary**

Remove School Keep Clear makings and reduce yellow lines

#### Issue

Wouldham All Saints Primary School is relocating to a new facility in February, so the existing school restrictions would become redundant and need to be removed to provide more parking opportunities for residents.

#### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 21 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	5 (62.5%)	3 (37.5%)	0	8 (38.1%)

The Parish Council also commented on the proposals, that a section of the proposed double yellow lines to the rear of No's 218-224 High Street be omitted, and the existing double yellow lines opposite the school and up to the junction with Oldfield Drive (save the junction protection) be removed.

#### **Analysis**

The responses were broadly in favour, but those who objected wanted the proposed double yellow lines to the rear of No's 218-228 High Street to be omitted.

Unfortunately (with regard to the Parish Council comments) the removal of the yellow lines east of the school to Oldfield Drive would allow parking on a bend, opposite an access and through a narrow section and we should not allow parking.

## Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals be amended to delete the proposed double yellow line to the rear of 218-228 High Street, but not to reduce the double yellow lines on the southern side of the School Lane and proceed to formal consultation.

#### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 21 properties, we received 3 responses, 1 in favour of the proposal and 2 against.

Wouldham Parish Council also responded in favour of the proposal.

# **Analysis**

One objection was that the introduction of yellow lines to the junction of School Lane and the High Street would increase traffic in and out of School Lane.

The other objection was from a resident who was concerned that parking opposite his driveway would cause problems, and that the proposed double yellow lines on the south side of the road be extended to cover No's 218 – 224.

However, this was part of the previous consultation and received adverse comments from the Parish Council, who asked that the proposals be in their current form.

## **Formal Recommendation**

Location reference	Phase 9-21
Town	Wouldham
Ward	Burham & Wouldham
Road / Area	Knowle Road / Hall Road
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD-508-01 Phase 9 - Wouldham - Hall Road

## **Summary**

Extended yellow line restrictions to ease traffic movements

#### Issue

The Parish Council and one of the bus companies have asked for restrictions to prevent obstructive parking on High Street and in Hall Road, to ease bus movements.

## Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 37 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0	5 (13.5%)

## **Analysis**

The responses were mixed. One objector suggested that the proposals did not go far enough and wanted restrictions through the entirety of the High Street to ease bus movements.

The other two objectors reported that there had never been a parking issue at this location until the opening of the bridge.

## Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

#### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 37 properties, we received 8 responses, 5 in favour of the proposal and 2 against, with one that did not express a clear view.

Wouldham Parish Council also responded in favour of the proposal.

#### **Analysis**

Both objections raised points that there was an increase in traffic associated with the

opening of the new bridge, and that the road was being used as a rat-run, and that the proposals did not create any additional parking places.

The comment that expressed no clear view was in favour of measures to ease traffic movements, but was concerned about parking displacement, particularly as the nearby Parish Council car park was in "terrible" condition.

However, the proposals are designed to assist buses accessing bus stops and also to prevent obstructive parking in areas where the Highway Code already states that it should not occur.

There is a nearby parking facility that could be used, though its maintenance would be an issue for the Parish Council to address.

## **Formal Recommendation**

Location reference	Phase 9-22
Town	Wouldham
Ward	Burham & Wouldham
Road / Area	High Street (Knowle Road to Portland Road)
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD-508-07 Phase 9 - Wouldham - High Street

## **Summary**

Extended yellow line restrictions to ease traffic movements

#### Issue

The Parish Council and one of the bus companies have asked for restrictions to prevent obstructive parking on High Street between Knowle Road and Portland Road, to ease bus movements.

#### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 32 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	2 (33.3%)	4 (66.7%)	0	6 (18.8%)

## **Analysis**

The 4 objections were mainly on the points of the loss of parking and that removing obstructive parking would encourage more rat-running and higher speeds that have come about since the new bridge was opened.

There was also comment that if the buses had problems then they should re-route.

The proposal is for a minor extension to the yellow lines to allow buses (and any other large rigid vehicle – including fire appliances) to turn at the Medway Inn junction, and still allow opposing traffic to pass.

#### Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

## **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 32 properties, we received 4 responses, 2 in favour of the proposal and 2 against.

Wouldham Parish Council also responded in favour of the proposal.

# **Analysis**

One objection raised points that there was an increase in traffic associated with the opening of the new bridge, and that the road was being used as a rat-run.

The other objection was that the parked vehicles provided protection to pedestrians on the pavement, and that the road is not wide enough for 2 way traffic.

However, the proposal is only a minor extension of the restrictions, to allow bus movements and allow opposing traffic to pass a turning bus. Parking would be retained for a considerable length on the east side of the road that could protect the footway.

#### **Formal Recommendation**

Location reference	Phase 9-23
Town	Wouldham
Ward	Burham & Wouldham
Road / Area	High Street / Ferry Lane
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD-508-02 Phase 9 - Wouldham - Ferry Lane and High Street

## **Summary**

Extended yellow line restrictions to ease traffic movements, new enforceable disabled parking bays and bus stop.

#### Issue

The Parish Council and one of the bus companies have asked for restrictions to prevent obstructive parking around the Ferry Lane junction. Also there were requests for enforceable disabled parking bays and bus stops.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21<sup>st</sup> October to 12<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 30 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	2 (100%)	0	0	2 (6.7%)

### **Analysis**

The response rate was low and in favour of the proposal

## Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

## **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 30 properties, we received 3 responses, 1 in favour of the proposal and 2 against.

Wouldham Parish Council also responded in favour of the proposal.

## **Analysis**

One of the objections was that a bus stop clearway should not be introduced as the existing double yellow lines should be retained, but agreed that there should be no parking at the Ferry Lane junction.

The other objection (who had young children) was that the proposal would reduce nearby convenient parking.

However, the proposals are designed to assist buses accessing bus stops and also to prevent obstructive parking in areas where the Highway Code already states that it should not occur.

## **Formal Recommendation**

Location reference	Phase 9-24
Town	Wouldham
Ward	Burham & Wouldham
Road / Area	High Street / Walter Burke Avenue
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD-508-03 Phase 9 - Wouldham - Walter Burke Avenue

## **Summary**

Reduce existing double yellow lines to allow more on-street parking

#### Issue

Parking is an issue in Wouldham and there is an opportunity to reduce restrictions to allow more on-street parking.

## Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 19 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)	0	8 (42.1%)

## **Analysis**

The responses in favour were welcoming the additional parking places, and the responses against were concerned about parking close to the junction and across the end of the footpath alongside No.2.

The existing bellmouth of the junction is very wide with generous radii and the shortening of the existing double yellow lines should not have a significant impact.

## Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposed shortening of the double yellow lines be reduced, to keep the footpath end clear, and the amended proposals proceed to formal consultation.

## **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 19 properties, we received 6 responses, 4 in favour of the proposal and 2 against.

Wouldham Parish Council also responded in favour of the proposal.

# **Analysis**

One of the objections was that vans from properties in the High Street would park in the space, reducing visibility when turning out of Walter Burke Avenue.

The other echoed the comments about reduced visibility if vans were parked there.

However, the proposed reduction still maintains a sizeable area at the junction where parking is not allowed, which exceeds the requirements of the Highway Code for visibility, and the layout of the junction and the road widths gives generous room for turning vehicles.

## **Formal Recommendation**

Location reference	Phase 9-25
Town	Wouldham
Ward	Burham & Wouldham
Road / Area	School Lane / High Street (Rochester Road)
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD-508-04 Phase 9 - Wouldham - Wouldham Road

## **Summary**

Extended yellow line restrictions to ease traffic movements (especially for buses) and an enforceable disabled parking bay

#### Issue

The Parish Council and one of the bus companies have asked for restrictions to prevent obstructive parking on High Street and Rochester Road, to ease bus movements, and for a new disabled parking bay.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 23 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	2 (33.3%)	3 (50%)	1 (16.7%)	6 (26.1%)

## **Analysis**

The responses were mixed, with some in favour and some against.

One objector commented that the proposed double yellow lines on the west side may displace parking to the east side (outside their house).

One objected that allowing parking on the west side gave an element of protection to pedestrians.

There were also comments that the proposals would reduce parking for the church.

There was also comment about rat-running through the village since the opening of the bridge.

There was also comment that the disabled bay was no longer required.

It should be noted that the proposals were specifically requested by one of the local bus companies, as parking at this location impeded their service provision.

The "Don't Know" returned the form but did not indicate any preference.

#### Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals be amended, with the disabled parking bay deleted, and proceed to formal consultation.

### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 23 properties, we received 4 responses, 2 in favour of the proposal and 2 against.

Wouldham Parish Council also responded in favour of the proposal.

# Analysis

One of the objections repeated their comments from the informal consultation stage, that the proposed double yellow lines on the west side may displace parking to the east side (outside their house). They also commented that allowing parking on the west side gave an element of protection to pedestrians, and that the proposals would reduce parking for the church.

They also repeated their comment about rat-running through the village since the opening of the bridge.

The other objection was broadly in support of the proposals but did not want anything that would speed up traffic, so wished that consideration be given to additional traffic calming measures.

The proposals are intended to ease traffic movements and assist buses.

## **Formal Recommendation**

The proposals are intended to ease traffic movements and assist buses. With this in mind it is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and that the changes to the Order are to be made and the restrictions be introduced.

Location reference	Phase 9-26
Town	Wouldham
Ward	Burham & Wouldham
Road / Area	Knowle Road / Cornwall Crescent
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD-508-05 Phase 9 - Wouldham - Knowle Road and Cornwall
	Crescent

# Summary

New yellow line restrictions and bus stop clearway

#### Issue

The Parish council have passed on concerns about parking that could reduce visibility and restrict traffic movements around the junction of Cornwall Crescent and also around the end of the Tramway.

## Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 21st October to 12th November 2017.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 47 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Response rate
Properties	4 (44.4%)	4 (44.4%)	1 (11.2%)	9 (19.1%)

The Parish Council also commented, and asked for additional double yellow lines to the west of the area, to prevent parking near the traffic calming build-outs to ease bus movements.

#### **Analysis**

The responses were evenly split, but the objections tended to relate to loss of parking facility.

One objector wanted more restrictions, because their driveway was not suitable for their needs, but they ought to apply to Kent Highways to have their dropped-kerb extended to match their off-street parking arrangement.

One objector expressed mobility issues, and is advised to contact Kent County Council for disabled "blue badge" which would ease movement and allow more flexible parking.

The "Don't Know" returned the form but did not indicate any preference.

#### Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals be extended in line with the Parish Council proposals and proceed to formal consultation.

### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We

also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 47 properties, we received 7 responses, 3 in favour of the proposal and 4 against.

Wouldham Parish Council also responded in favour of the proposal.

## **Analysis**

One objection was that deliveries of coal, wood and oil, and other deliveries would have nowhere to park.

Two commented in objection to the proposals but gave no specific reasons.

One objection cited the reduction in on-street parking, and commented that the bus stop clearways were unnecessary.

There were also comments that parking restrictions at the end of The Tramway were not necessary as the public right of way had been used for many years without complaint.

However, the proposed restrictions were developed in liaison with the Parish Council, who asked for the restrictions at the end of The Tramway and for restrictions to prevent obstruction and assist buses.

With regard to delivery vehicles, - it should be considered that loading and unloading is permitted on double yellow lines.

## **Formal Recommendation**

Location reference	Phase 9-27
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Barden Park Road
Requested by	Allotment Association
Plan reference:	DD-580-26 Phase 9 - Tonbridge - Barden Park Road

# **Summary**

Alteration to existing permit parking bays to facilitate a new vehicle access, with permission already granted by Kent County Council.

#### Issue

The Allotment Association have installed new gates and a hardstanding to the allotments in Barden Road, and have been given the relevant permissions from the Highway Authority to install a dropped kerb to facilitate vehicle access.

This requires that the existing parking bays be altered to reflect the changes.

### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 17 properties, we received 1 response, in favour of the proposal.

#### **Formal Recommendation**

As there were no objections to the proposal, the changes to the Order are to be made and the restrictions be introduced.

Location reference	Phase 9-28
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	23 Douglas Road
Requested by	Developer of 23 Douglas Road
Plan reference:	DD-580-23 Phase 9 - Tonbridge - Douglas Road near 23

# **Summary**

Alteration to existing permit parking bays to facilitate a new vehicle access (now installed), with permission already granted by Kent County Council.

#### Issue

The developer of No.23 Douglas Road has installed a hardstanding and vehicle crossover, with the relevant permissions from the Highway Authority.

This requires that the existing parking bays be altered to reflect the changes.

#### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 18 properties, we received no response.

### **Formal Recommendation**

As there were no objections to the proposal, the changes to the Order are to be made and the restrictions be introduced.

Location reference	Phase 9-29
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	72 Douglas Road
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD-580-24 Phase 9 - Tonbridge - Douglas Road near 72

## **Summary**

Alteration to existing permit parking bays to facilitate a new vehicle access (now installed), with permission already granted by Kent County Council.

#### Issue

The developer of No.72 Douglas Road has installed a hardstanding and vehicle crossover, with the relevant permissions from the Highway Authority.

#### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 13 properties, we received 3 responses, 1 in favour of the proposal, one against and one not objecting, but asking for alterations to the other end of the parking bay.

# **Analysis**

The objection cited the loss of parking spaces in the road, however, permission for a dropped kerb had been granted by the Highway Authority, and the changes to the parking restrictions have to reflect the newly established right of access to that off-street parking facility.

Unfortunately it is not possible to extend the parking bay westwards due to the proximity of the junction with Sussex Road vehicle accesses

#### **Formal Recommendation**

It is recommended that in light of Kent County Council's granted permissions, the Board set aside the objection and that the changes to the Order are to be made to reflect the current bay location.

Location reference	Phase 9-30
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Garage to 82 Douglas Road (in Sussex Road)
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD-580-25 Phase 9 - Tonbridge - Sussex Road near 82 Douglas
	Road

## **Summary**

Alteration to existing permit parking bays to facilitate a new vehicle access to an existing gate and garage, with permission already granted by Kent County Council.

### Issue

The owner of the garage to the rear of No.82 Douglas Road has received the relevant permissions from Kent County Council as the Highway Authority for the installation and operation of a vehicle crossover.

#### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 13 properties, we received 5 objections.

# **Analysis**

The objections cite mainly the loss of parking facility, but also the unsuitability and size of the garage structure for a crossover.

However, permission for a dropped kerb had been granted by the Highway Authority, and the changes to the parking restrictions have to reflect the newly established right of access. The access is established regardless of the size of the garage, and whilst small it is large enough to store motor vehicles that may need access to the Highway.

## **Formal Recommendation**

It is recommended that in light of Kent County Council's granted permissions, the Board set aside the objections and that the changes to the Order and restrictions are made.

Location reference	Phase 9-31
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Hectorage Road
Requested by	Resident of No.25
Plan reference:	DD-580-27 Phase 9 - Tonbridge - Hectorage Road

# **Summary**

Alteration to existing permit parking bays to facilitate a new vehicle access (now installed), with permission already granted by Kent County Council.

#### Issue

The resident of No.25 Hectorage Road has installed a hardstanding and vehicle crossover, with the relevant permissions from the Highway Authority.

This requires that the existing parking bays be altered to reflect the changes.

#### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 36 properties (though 2 were returned undelivered), we received 3 responses, all in favour of the proposal.

#### **Formal Recommendation**

As there were no objections to the proposal, the changes to the Order are to be made and the restrictions be introduced.

Location reference	Phase 9-32
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Castle
Road / Area	Stafford Road
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD-580-22 Phase 9 - Tonbridge - Stafford Road

# **Summary**

A resident that meets Kent County Council's criteria for a disabled parking facility to be provided on the public highway has applied for a facility to assist their mobility.

## Issue

The valid application for a disabled parking facility requires the alteration of the existing resident permit parking bays in the road.

## **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 9 properties, we received 2 responses, both in favour of the proposal.

# **Formal Recommendation**

As there were no objections to the proposal, the changes to the Order are to be made and the restrictions be introduced.

Location reference	Phase 9-33
Town	Eccles
Ward	Aylesford North & Walderslade
Road / Area	Cork Street & Belgrave Street
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD-580-21 Phase 9 - Eccles - Cork Street and Belgrave Street

## **Summary**

The traffic regulation order that defines the disabled parking bay in on Cork Street, Eccles (close to the junction with Belgrave Street) needs to be redefined to reflect it's new size.

#### Issue

The pre-existing disabled bay in Cork Street was of a substandard size, and as enlarged to meet the current standards. However, this has resulted in a discrepancy between the actual bay marking and the definition in the traffic regulation order. The proposal is intended to redefine the bay at its current size and location rathern than introduce any further alteration.

#### **Formal Consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals from 26<sup>th</sup> January to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and advertisements in the local newspapers. We also placed the consultation documents on-deposit at the Council offices and on our web pages.

Though we consulted, and wrote to 32 properties, we received 4 responses, 3 in favour and one against the proposal.

## **Analysis**

The objection was from residents that did not want the disabled bay extended further towards their property.

As the proposal does not extend the bay towards their property, the objection should be considered as not relevant to what is proposed.

## **Formal Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board set aside the objection and that the changes to the Order are to be made to reflect the current bay location.